

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

REMARKS

The Examiner's attention is drawn to commonly assigned U.S. Patent Application No. 09/457,006.

Claims 15 to 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 15 recites the limitation "the form of a metal foil" in line 2 and "the form of a plastic film" in line 10 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. It also noted that claims 15 and 22 recite the limitation "the polyester, polyamide, or polyolefin type" in lines 6 to 7 and 3 to 4, respectively. It stated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and that, further, it is unclear what the term "type" encompasses. The Office Action stated that, lastly, claim 15 recites the limitation "the coextrusion coated, coextruded and/or extrusion laminated polyamide/polypropylene type" in lines 10 to 12 and that this limitation is unclear and lacks antecedent basis in the claim. These matters have been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 16 recites the limitations "the free surface" of "the first layer of bonding agent" on lines 4 and 5 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. These matters have been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that, further, it is noted that the term "lies over" is unclear for a first layer may "lie over" a second layer via a third intermediate layer placed between the first and second layers. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 17 to 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that the claims recite the limitation "layer type structure" in line 2 of claims 17 to 25 and that it is unclear what the term "type" encompasses. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that, further, claims 17, 19, 20, and 25 recite the limitation "a layer type structure with one

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

layer superimposed over the other comprising . . .
polypropylene." This matter has been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that, considering there is no clear indication of which layer comprises what, i.e., utilizing "/" to differentiate clearly the different layers, it is unclear from this limitation how many layers are present and what each layer comprises. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

Claim 17 has been further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 17 recites the limitations "the free side" of "the coextruded bonding agent layer" in line 5 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that, further, it is noted that the term "bonded agent" in line 3 is unclear. This matter has been clarified in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

The Office Action stated that claim 18 recites the limitation "laminate adhesive and laminate bonded a polyamide/bonding agent/polypropylene film" in lines 3 and 4 and that it is unclear what is meant by "bonded a." This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 19 recites the limitation "the first extruded bonding agent layer" in lines 4 and 5 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that, further, it is unclear what is meant by the term "laminated bonded polyamide film" in line 3. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

**Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713**

The Office Action stated that claim 20 recites the limitation "the first bonding agent" in line 4 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 24 recites the limitation "the laminate adhesive layer" in line 5 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

The Office Action stated that claim 24 recites the limitation "comprising laminate adhesive and laminate bonded a film of" in line 3 and that it is unclear what the term "bonded a" means. This matter has been clarified in the claims.

The Office Action further noted that claim 24 recites that "layer (c) lies on the laminate adhesive layer on the metal foil." It stated that claim 24, however, is dependent on claim 21, which is dependent on claim 16 which recites that "layer (c) lies over the free surface of the first layer of bonding agent." It stated that, therefore, it is unclear whether the applicants meant for claim 24 to be dependent on claim 21 or

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

claim 22 which also includes the additional polypropylene layer. This matter has been clarified in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 25 recites the limitation "the first polypropylene layer" in lines 4 and 5 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 27 recites the limitation "wherein between . . . a laminate adhesive is provided in an amount from 0.5 to 10 g/m², or a bonding agent with a thickness of 0.5 to 15 μm " in lines 1 to 4. It stated that it is unclear from this limitation whether "or a bonding agent" is provided between the plastic layer and the metal foil layer or what exactly the "or a bonding agent" limitation is referring to. It further stated that the Examiner suggests

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

rearranging the terms to read "wherein between . . . a laminate adhesive in an amount from 0.5 to 10 g/m² or a bonding agent with a thickness of 0.5 to 15 μm is provided." The claims have been amended to eliminate this problem.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claim 28 recites the limitation "the laminate adhesive" in lines 1 and 2 and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This matter has been corrected in the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out particularly and claim distinctly the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action stated that claims 29 and 31 recite the limitation "pouch type" in line 1 and that it is unclear what the term "type" encompasses.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

is included or excluded by the claim language. The method claims have been cancelled.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. The method claims have been cancelled.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the admitted prior art on page 1 of the specification teaches a sterilizable composite film employed in the manufacture of pouches for packaging foods comprising a four-layer composite film with one layer after another of a polyester film, an aluminum foil, an oriented polyamide film, and a polypropylene film. It further stated that each of the four layers is joined to the neighboring layers by means of an adhesive and/or primer. There is no anticipation of applicants' new claims because, for example, the admitted prior art does not disclose a second functional layer (c) having sequential layers of a first polypropylene layer, a polyamide layer, and a second polypropylene layer. Anticipation requires disclosure of all of the elements of a claim.

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

The Office Action stated that, considering extrusion, coextrusion and coextrusion coating are conventional processing steps in fabricating multilayer laminates and do not change the material composition or structure of the final product composite. It stated that the admitted prior art anticipates the above-cited claims of the invention. Applicants traverse these statements. Applicants have shown above that the admitted prior art does not anticipate the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Misasa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,559,266). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that Misasa et al. teach a laminated material useful for packaging materials for foodstuffs that has superior gas barrier properties, light shielding properties, and moisture resistance (Abstract). It stated that the laminate comprises an inner layer of polyolefin such as polypropylene (A), a second gas barrier layer consisting essentially of a saponified product of ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer, polyester resin, or polyamide resin (B), a third metal layer such as aluminum (C), and a fourth outer layer such as polyester resin like PETP (claim 1, column 2, lines 12 to 18; column 2, lines 51 to 56; and column 3, lines 24 to 40). It also stated that, in producing the laminated material, it is preferred

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

to employ a process in which a laminated material of layers A and B and a laminated material of layers C and D are previously produced and the two laminated materials are then laminated to each other (column 4, lines 10 to 14). The Office Action further stated that the laminate can be formed by bonding the layers together by an suitable procedure such as extrusion lamination or dry lamination using an adhesive coating or primer (column 3, lines 51, to column 4, line 9, and the examples); that the amount of adhesive coated is from 2 to 10 grams per square meter and preferably between 1.5 and 8 grams per square meter (column 3, lines 67, to column 4, line 2); that between layer B and C may be interposed if necessary a suitable lay of a synthetic resin such as polyethylene or polypropylene (column 3, lines 2 to 24); and that the laminate can be sterilized and used as a food packaging material or to form containers for packaging foods (column 3, lines 60 to 64, and column 4, lines 41 to 44). Applicants traverse these statements. There is no anticipation of applicants' claims because, for example, Misasa et al. do not specifically disclose a second functional layer (c) having sequential layers of polypropylene, polyamide, and polypropylene.

Column 2, lines 1 to 8, and figure 1 of Misasa et al. show sequential layers of adhesive for dry lamination (5), polyolefin (3'), gas barrier resin (4) and polyolefin (3). Column 2 also discloses that the polyolefin can be polypropylene and the gas

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

barrier resin can be polyamide resin. This does not constitute anticipation, since the number of choices from which selections must be made is too large. Further, applicants' claims require coextrusion, coextrusion coating, and/or extrusion lamination. Nowhere do Misasa et al. disclose a composite film which fulfills all of the specifics of applicants' claims.

The composites of examples 7 and 8 of Misasa et al. do not meet applicants' claims.

The laminated material disclosed by Misasa et al. further differs from the composite film of the present invention in that the metal layer is a very thin vacuum deposited layer and not a foil.

The Office Action stated that, considering extrusion, coextrusion and coextrusion coating are conventional processing steps in fabricating multilayer laminates and do not change the material composition or structure of the final product composite. It also stated that Misasa et al. anticipate the above cited claims of the invention. Applicants traverse this statement. Applicants have shown above that Misasa et al. do not anticipate the claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 20, 22, 25, and 29 to 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,291,085). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that Ito et al. teach a packaging material for food to be subject to sterilization which comprises a flexible laminate sheet including a heat-sealable inner layer of polypropylene (a), an aluminum foil intermediate layer (c), an outer layer of heat-resistant thermoplastic or thermosetting resin such as the polyester PETP or a biaxially oriented film (b), one or more impact-absorbing layers between (a) and (c) or (b) and (c), and if necessary, adhesive or primer layers interposed between every two adjacent layers (Abstract; column 3, lines 35 to 45; column 4, lines 17 to 35; and column 7, line 65, to column 8, line 18). It also stated that the impact-absorbing layer is a thermoplastic resin having the desired impact properties such as stretched or unstretched polyamides or copolyamides, or stretched polypropylene having the desired impact absorbing coefficient and a melting point higher than the melting point of the polypropylene of (a) (column 9, lines 55 to 60; column 10, lines 34 to 36). The Officer Action further stated that the packaging laminate can be formed into bags for food packaging with the layer thickness selected to produce a laminate with the desired properties, with a preferred thickness selected to produce a laminate with the desired properties, with a preferred thickness of 10 to 50 μm for the outer layer, 10 to 50 μm for the oxygen barrier layer or 5 to 20 μm for the aluminum foil layer, and 30 to 100 μm for the heat-sealable polypropylene

*C. P.
F. G.
R. K.*

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

layer (a) and 5 to 40 μm for each impact-absorbing layer (column 12, lines 7 to 36). Applicants traverse these statements. There is no anticipation of applicants' claims because, for example, Ito et al. do not specifically disclose a second functional layer (c) having sequential layers of polypropylene, polyamide, and polypropylene.

Table B of Ito et al. says that two impact-absorbing layers can be used between the polypropylene layer and the aluminum foil, and columns 9 and 10 state that polyamides and specific stretched polypropylene can each be used as an impact-absorbing layer. This does not constitute anticipation since the number of choices from which selections must be made is vast. Further, applicants' claims require coextrusion, coextrusion coating, and/or extrusion lamination. Nowhere do Ito et al. disclose a composite film which fulfills all of the specifics of applicants' claims.

The Office Action stated that, considering extrusion, coextrusion and coextrusion coating are conventional processing steps in fabricating multilayer laminates and do not change the material composition or structure of the final product composite. It also stated that Ito et al. anticipate the above cited claims of the invention. Applicants traverse these statements. Applicants have shown above that Misasa et al. do not anticipate the claims.

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heyes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,079,052). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that Heyes et al. teach a laminated metal sheet having adhered to one of its major surfaces a composite coextruded polyolefin-containing film (B) comprising a plurality of layers in the following order: (B1) an inner layer of a bonding resin, (B2) a layer of a polyamide, (B3) a further layer of a bonding resin, (B4) a layer of a polyolefin (Abstract). It also stated that the composite further comprising a film (A) of a thermoplastic polymer adhered to the other major surface of the metal sheet where A is typically a composite polyester, polyamide, or polyolefin film (column 3, lines 41 to 46). The Office Action further stated that layer (B4) is most preferably polypropylene or ethylene/propylene copolymer with a thickness of 10 to 200 μm (column 2, lines 22 to 27) and that layer (B2) is a polyamide with a thickness less than 10 μm (column 2, lines 15 to 18). It stated that layers (B1) and (B3) are bonding resin layers with a thickness of 1 to 10 μm and are preferably based on polyethylene or polypropylene (column 3, lines 27 to 33). It also stated that the composite layer B may be formed by coextrusion (column 4, lines 57 to 58) and that the laminated sheet is particularly useful as a packaging material

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

such as for food cans (column 6, lines 60 to 64). Applicants traverse these statements. Heyes et al. do not disclose a layer sequence of polypropylene, polyamide, and polypropylene. So Heyes et al. do not anticipate applicants' claims.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art as applied to claims 15 to 20 above. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the teachings of the admitted prior art as discussed above do not include reference to any range in thickness for the individual layers or a second polypropylene inner lay. It also stated that, however, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the thickness of the individual layers and to include an additional polypropylene layer to produce a laminate with the desired properties, i.e., gas barrier, water vapor, heat-resistance, flexibility, and sealing properties for a desired food packaging article. Applicants traverse these statements. The admitted prior art does not teach or suggest a second functional layer (c) having sequential layers of polypropylene, polyamide, and polypropylene. Hence, applicants' claims are not obvious over the admitted prior art.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

Claims 15 to 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misasa et al. as applied to claims 15 to 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, and 30 above. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action stated that the teachings of Misasa et al. as discussed above do not include reference to any range in thickness for the individual layers. It also stated that in the absence of unexpected results, however, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the thickness of the individual layers and to include an additional polypropylene layer to produce a laminate with the desired properties, i.e., gas barrier, water vapor, heat-resistance, flexibility, and sealing properties for a desired food packaging article. Applicants traverse these statements. Misasa et al. do not specifically disclose applicants' claimed invention. There is no motivation of record to try to piece together parts of Misasa et al. to come up with applicants' claimed invention. The burden of proof under Section 103(a) is upon the Examiner, and the use of forbidden hindsight does not fulfill the burden.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. as applied to claims 15 to 20, 22, 25, 29, and 30 above. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

The Office Action stated that the teachings of Ito et al. discussed above do not include the entire thickness range for certain layers of the instant claimed invention. It also stated that in the absence of unexpected results, however, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the thickness of the individual layers and the number of polypropylene layers to produce a laminate with the desired properties, i.e., gas barrier, water vapor, heat-resistance, flexibility, and sealing properties for a desired food packaging article. Applicants traverse these statements. Ito et al. do not specifically disclose applicants' claimed invention. There is no motivation of record to try to piece together parts of Misasa et al. to come up with applicants' claimed invention. The burden of proof under Section 103(a) is upon the Examiner, and the use of forbidden hindsight does not fulfill the burden.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 15 to 31 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 10 of copending Application No. 09/457,006. Applicants disagree with this provision rejection.

The Office Action stated that, although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

each other because it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize polyamide alternatively as the first functional layer, given that it provides equivalent barrier properties to that of a polyester film. It stated that it would also have been obvious to optimize the thickness of the individual layers and the number of polypropylene layers to produce a laminate with the desired properties, i.e., gas barrier, water vapor, heat resistance, flexibility, and sealing properties for a desired food packaging article. The Office Action further noted that lamination, extrusion, coextrusion, and coextrusion coating are conventional processing steps in fabricating multilayer laminates and do not change the material composition or structure of the final product composite.

Applicants disagree with this statement.

This rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration, reexamination, and allowance of the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Virgil H. Marsh
Registration No. 23,083

April 19, 2001
Date
Fisher, Christen & Sabol
Suite 1401
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2000

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

15. (Amended) A sterilizable composite film containing a barrier layer that is impermeable to water vapor and gases [in the form of] comprising a metal foil, and on both sides of the barrier layer at least one functional layer, the composite film [has] having a layer structure containing one on top of the other in the following sequence:

(a) a first functional layer containing a plastic film [of the] that is a polyester, a polyamide, or a polyolefin, [type], or an extrusion layer of [polyolefins] a polyolefin, or one or more lacquer layers or print and lacquer layers or print layers[, and];

(b) a metal foil[, and]

(c) a second functional layer [in the form of] containing a plastic film [of the] that is a layer comprising a [coextrusion coated,] coextrusion-coated, a coextruded, and/or [extrusion laminated polyamide/polypropylene film type] an extrusion-laminated film having a sequence of a first polypropylene layer, a polyamide layer, and a second polypropylene layer.

16. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim 15, wherein the [plastic layer, layer (c), has a layer arrangement comprising coextrusion coated, coextruded and/or extrusion laminated bonding agent/polyamide/bonding agent/

polypropylene, where layer (c) lies over the free surface of the first layer of bonding agent on the metal foil, layer (b)] second functional layer (c) comprises a coextrusion-coated, a coextruded, and/or an extrusion-laminated film having a sequence of a first bonding agent layer, a first polypropylene-second bonding agent layer, a polyamide layer, a third bonding agent layer, and a second polypropylene layer, the first bonding agent adhering together the metal foil (b) and the second functional layer (c).

17. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim 16, wherein the [plastic layer, layer (c), has a layer type structure with one layer superimposed over the other, comprising coextruded bonded agent and polyamide and extruded bonding agent and laminate bonded polypropylene film, whereby layer (c) lies on the free side of the coextruded bonding agent layer on the metal foil, layer (b)] second functional layer (c) comprises a film having a sequence of a first bonding agent layer, a first polypropylene layer, a second bonding agent layer, a polyamide layer, a third bonding agent layer, and a second polypropylene layer, comprising extruded first bonding agent, laminated bonded first polypropylene, coextruded second bonding agent and polyamide, extruded third bonding agent, and laminated bonded second polypropylene, the first bonding agent adhering together the metal foil (b) and the second functional layer (c).

18. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim 15, wherein the [plastic layer, layer (c), has a layer type structure with one layer superimposed over the other, comprising laminate adhesive and laminate bonded a polyamide/bonding agent/polypropylene film, whereby the laminate adhesive layer lies on the metal foil, layer (b)] second functional layer (c) comprises a film having a sequence of a first laminate adhesive layer, a first polypropylene layer, a second laminate adhesive layer, and laminate bonded layered unit having a sequence of a polyamide layer, a bonding agent, and a polypropylene layer, the first laminate adhesive adhering together the metal foil (b) and the second functional layer (c).

19. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim 16, wherein the [plastic layer, layer (c), has a layer type structure with one layer superimposed over the other, comprising bonding agent, laminated bonded polyamide film, extruded bonding agent and laminate bonded polypropylene film, whereby the first extruded bonding agent layer lies on the metal foil, layer (b)] second functional layer (c) comprises a film having a sequence of a coextension coated first bonding agent layer, a first polypropylene layer, a second bonding agent layer, a polyamide layer, a third bonding agent layer, and a second polypropylene layer, the first bonding agent adhering together the metal foil (b) and the second functional layer (c).

Claim 20 has been cancelled.

21. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim 16, wherein the [plastic layer, layer (c), has a layer type structure with one layer superimposed over the other, comprising coextrusion, coextruded and/or extrusion laminated bonding agent with a thickness of 3 to 15 μm /polyamide with a thickness of 10 to 40 μm /bonding agent with a thickness of 3 to 15 μm /polypropylene with a thickness of 30 to 70 μm] second functional layer (c) comprises a film having a sequence of a first bonding agent layer, a first polypropylene layer with a thickness of 10 to 20 μm , a second bonding agent layer with a thickness of 3 to 15 μm , a polyamide layer with a thickness of 10 to 40 μm , a third bonding agent layer with a thickness of 3 to 15 μm , a second polypropylene layer with a thickness of 30 to 70 μm .

22. (Amended) [The] A sterilizable composite film [according to claim 15, wherein] containing a barrier layer that is impermeable to water vapor and gases comprising a metal foil and on both sides of the barrier layer at least one functional layer, the composite film [has] having a layer type structure containing [in sequence] one on top of the other:

(a) a first functional layer containing a first plastic film [of the] that is a polyester, a polyamide, or a polyolefin [type] or an extrusion layer of [polyolefins] a

Amendment
Appl. No. 09/505,713

polyolefin or one or more lacquer layers, or print and lacquer layers, or print layers[, and]i

(b) a metal [foil, and] foil; and
(c) a [plastic layer having a layer type of structure comprising coextrusion coated, coextruded and/or extrusion laminated polypropylene/polyamide/polypropylene] second functional layer that is a second plastic film consisting of a coextruded polyamide-polypropylene film.

Claims 23, 24, 25, and 26 have been cancelled.

27. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim [15] 16, wherein, [between the plastic layer, layer (c), and the metal foil, layer (b), a laminate adhesive is provided in an amount from 0.5 to 10 g/m², or a] in the second functional layer (c), each bonding agent [with] has a thickness of 0.5 to 15 μm.

28. (Amended) The sterilizable composite film according to claim [26] 18, [wherein the] wherein, in second functional layer (c), each laminate adhesive is provided in an amount of 0.5 to 10 g/m²[, or the bonding agent has a thickness of 3 to 15 μm].

29. (Amended) A pouch [type of] for packaging, made from [a] the sterilizable composite film according to claim 15.

Claims 30 and 31 have been cancelled.

New claims 32 to 35 have been added.